



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,868	06/26/2003	William J. Grundmann	884.A38US1	5510
21186	7590	02/28/2006	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH 1600 TCF TOWER 121 SOUTH EIGHT STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			WHITMORE, STACY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2825	

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/606,868	GRUNDMANN, WILLIAM J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stacy A. Whitmore	2825	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

FINAL ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims recite the limitation "creating bypass logic in a digital circuit design that is without bypass logic" which was not described in the specification prior to the amendment dated December 12, 2005.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

I. As for claims 1, 8, 15, and 21, the claimed limitation "creating a bypass logic in a digital circuit design that is without bypass logic" is unclear and inherently

contradictive. How can a bypass logic be created without actually having bypass logic after bypass logic is created? Clarify.

II. Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-20, and 22-23 are also rejected by virtue of their dependence upon a rejected independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 8-11, 15-17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vashi (US Patent 6,219,819).

4. As for claims 1-3, 5, 8-11, and 15-17, Vashi 6,219,819 discloses the invention as claimed, including a method, apparatus, and article of manufacture comprising machine accessible medium including instructions for creating bypass logic in a digital circuit design that is without bypass logic, wherein creating comprises transforming a conditional state element into a logically redundant element in the digital circuit design, the transforming comprising:

[Note that the limitation "creating bypass logic in a digital circuit design that is without bypass logic" in the preamble of the claim is not given patentable weight because the limitation has no bearing on the actual transformation steps in the body of the claim. Further, the limitation "creating bypass logic in a digital circuit design that is without bypass logic" is accomplished by the transformation steps as rejected in the following claims]

Coupling a first latency delay unit to a data input of the conditional state element [fig. 3, elements 301-303 – first latency delay units, elements 321-323 – conditional state elements];

Coupling a second latency delay unit to an enable input of the conditional state element [fig. 3, elements 304-306 – second latency delay units, elements 321-323 – conditional state elements];

Coupling a first input of a multiplexer to an output of the conditional state element [fig. 3, elements 301-306 – multiplexers, elements 321-323 – conditional state elements, the first and second inputs of the multiplexers are coupled in several ways to the Q outputs of the elements 321-323];

Coupling a second input of the multiplexer to the data input of the conditional state element [fig. 3, elements 301-306 – multiplexers, elements 321-323 – conditional state elements, the first and second inputs of the multiplexers are coupled in several ways to the Q outputs of the elements 321-323];

Coupling a select line of the multiplexer to the enable input of the conditional state element [fig. 3, elements 301-306 – multiplexers, elements 321-323 – conditional state elements, the scan in/ enable inputs of the multiplexers are coupled in several ways to the Q outputs of the elements 321-323];

A memory, processor, bus coupled to the memory and processor, identifying a conditional state element [fig. 1, col. 4, lines 10-52];

Coupling first and second latency delay unit comprises a signal with a delay of one unit into the data input of the conditional state element [the signal from elements 301-306 have at least a delay of one unit];

Transforming any one of a flip-flop, register file, and a deterministic memory into a logically redundant element [fig. 3], the conditional state element comprises at least one of a flip-flop, register file, and a deterministic memory [fig. 3, elements 321-323].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vashi (US Patent 6,219,819) in view of McFarland (US Patent 6,212,629).

6. As for claims 22-23, Vashi discloses the invention as claimed, including the machine readable-medium that provides instructions for creating bypass logic in a digital circuit design that is without bypass logic, wherein creating comprises transforming a conditional state element into a logically redundant element as cited above.

Vashi does not specifically disclose replacing the conditional state element with a first multiplexer coupled to a first latency delay unit and coupling a second multiplexer that is coupled to a second latency delay unit to the first multiplexer.

McFarland discloses replacing conditional state element with a first multiplexer coupled to a first latency delay unit and second multiplexer that is coupled to a second latency delay unit to the first multiplexer [fig. 9C; col. 21 line 30 – col. 22, 10; wherein McFarland discloses that to replacement may be done between more than one pipeline stage, therefore incorporating a second multiplexer coupled to another delay unit as well as being coupled to the first multiplexer].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Vashi and McFarland because replacing Vashi's conditional state elements with multiplexers would have improved the handling of latency delays in a pipelined architecture for improving the throughput of data [see McFarland, col. 21, line 64 – col. 22, line 7].

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5, 8-11, 15-17, and 21-23 filed December 12, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. Applicant's arguments, filed December 12, 2005, with respect to claims 4, 6-7, 12-14, and 18-20 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of record has been withdrawn.

In the remarks, applicant argues in substance:

I. Vashi does not disclose creating bypass logic in a digital circuit design that is without bypass logic, wherein creating comprises transforming a conditional state element into a logically redundant element in the digital circuit design.

Examiner respectfully disagrees for the following reasons:

As to argument I: Vashi does disclose creating bypass logic in a digital circuit design that is without bypass logic, wherein creating comprises transforming a conditional state element into a logically redundant element in the digital circuit design [Note that the limitation "creating bypass logic in a digital circuit design that is without bypass logic" in the preamble of the claim is not given patentable weight because the limitation has no bearing on the actual transformation steps in the body of the claim. Further, the limitation "creating bypass logic in a digital circuit design that is without bypass logic" is accomplished by the transformation steps as rejected in the following claims; Further the cited portions concerning the coupling limitations as in claim 1 comprising the transformation steps include "creating bypass logic that is without bypass logic"];

9. Claims 4, 6-7, 12-14, and 18-20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record fails to disclose either singularly or in combination the invention as claimed including the methods, apparatus, and computer readable medium where the claimed subject matter of the F and G functions is claimed.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stacy A. Whitmore whose telephone number is (571) 272-1685. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, alternate Friday 6:30am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Chiang can be reached on (571) 272-7483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2825

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stacy A Whitmore

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2825

SAW

February 22, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SAW' followed by a stylized flourish.